

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the outstanding Office Action dated March 24, 2006.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamas in view of Heinrich and France '482. Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Domke. Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of either Gallie et al or Steen. In addition, the Examiner has stated that claims 5 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-9 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 10-11 which are rewritten from claims 5 and 6 in order to overcome the rejections and objection.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

June 20, 2006